

REMARKS

Claims 18-24, 30, 48-64 are pending in this application. Claims 19, 49, 53, 54 and 59-61 are amended, and claims 62-64 are added.

Claim 59 has been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

The Smith Reference

Claims 18 - 24 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,287,817 to Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 18 includes the feature of means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes, the means for heat reduction operating to reduce a temperature of the part of the at least one electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

Applicants submit that Smith does not teach or suggest to electrodes used for assessing conductivity of textiles to be dried. The electrodes 80, 81 are placed on clothes elevating vanes 66 preferably made of electrically insulating material and lacking any means which could be applied to divert excess heat from the electrodes. Also, the water absorptive material 82 placed below electrodes 80, 81 cannot serve to cool the electrodes. This water absorptive material 82 is simply applied to accumulate humidity in proportion to the humidity content of the textiles to be dried. As the water absorptive material is confined to the immediate surroundings of the electrodes, it will have a temperature equal to the temperature of the electrodes. No cooling effect will exist.

Further, Applicants submit that Smith does not disclose any means for heat reduction that reduces a temperature of any part of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer. Even if impeller member 76 of Smith could be considered a means for heat reduction (and Applicants submit that it cannot) there is no indication that impeller

member 76 would reduce the temperature of a part of the electrode below a temperature of the area to which that electrode is mounted (its receiving area).

Smith has nothing to do with cooling electrodes. The purpose of Smith is to reduce the likelihood of premature shut off of the drying operation by keeping the moisture content of the material 82 placed near the electrodes similar to that of the interior of fabrics being dried (col. 3, lines 39-41).

Claim 19 includes the feature of the means for heat reduction being arranged on a rear side of the electrodes opposite to a side of the electrodes that face a laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer, such that the rear side of the electrodes is the first area of the electrodes from which the means for heat reduction draws heat.

Applicants submit that Smith does not disclose any means for heat reduction that first draws heat from a side of the electrode opposite to a side that faces a laundry receiving area. Even if the impeller member 76 of Smith could be considered a means for heat reduction (and Applicants submit that it cannot) there is no indication that impeller member 76 would first draw heat from a side of the electrode opposite to a side that faces a laundry receiving area.

Claims 55, 56, 58 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 55, 56, 58 and 60 ultimately depend from claim 18. For at least the reasons discussed above, Smith does not suggest the features of claim 18. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that Smith suggests the features of claim 18.

Claim 56 includes the feature of the device being operable to reduce the heat of the respective one electrode to a level at which the respective one electrode substantially avoids evaporating liquid entrained in a liquid-air mixture in the interior of the laundry receiving area. Smith makes no mention of avoiding the evaporation of liquid on an electrode.

Claim 60 includes the feature of the means for heat reduction operating to reduce heat from the first electrode such that the exposed side of the first electrode is substantially prevented

from reaching the evaporation enabling temperature. Smith makes no mention of preventing an electrode from reaching an evaporation enabling temperature.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claims 18-24, 30, 55, 56, 58 and 60. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

The Frye Reference

Claims 48 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,511,839 to Frye. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 48 includes the features of an electrode of a moisture sensor fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and a cooler that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

Applicants believe that the Office Action has misinterpreted the purpose and function of the ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye. Ring electrodes 54, 55 subject the clothes within the drum of the dryer to a high frequency electric field to dry the clothes (col. 1, lines 28-30; col. 5, lines 1-2). Frye does not disclose or even suggest that ring electrodes 54, 55 in any way sense moisture.

In the embodiment shown in Frye, ring electrodes 54, 55 are placed outside of the drum and thus outside the region where heating by the field generated by the electrodes occurs. According to Frye however, the electrodes are used to generate a field of strength sufficient to heat up the clothes placed in the field. If Frye contemplates dissipating heat from the electrodes, it cannot be heat that is a part of the heat generated by the RF field. Rather, it would be heat generated from electric current flowing through the electrodes due to the ohmic resistance of the electrodes themselves. However, in the case of a mere sensor application of the electrodes, the RF field would be much weaker, and the problem of excess heating of the electrodes would not occur at all. In addition, the electrodes of Frye are placed distant from the laundry to be dried and even outside the drum containing the laundry. Therefore, the problem of accumulation of

residuals cannot occur with these electrodes. Accordingly, Frye's configuration cannot serve to indicate a means to avert such problem.

Further, Applicants submit that Frye does not disclose any means for heat reduction that reduces a temperature of any part of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer.

Claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 57 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frye. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 57 and 61 ultimately depend from claim 48. For at least the reasons discussed above, Frye does not suggest the features of claim 48. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that Frye suggests the features of claim 48.

In addition, claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 57 and 61 ultimately depend from new claim 62. Claim 62 includes the feature of the respective receiving area of the electrode being located in a laundry receiving area of the dryer. In contrast, ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye are not located in the laundry receiving area of the dryer.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Frye does not teach or suggest the features of claims 48-53, 57 and 61. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

The Frye Reference in view of the Turetta Reference

Claim 54 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frye in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,228,212 to Turetta. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 54 ultimately depends from claim 48 and claim 62. Applicants submit that Turetta does not remedy the deficiencies of Frye discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 48 and 62.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the combination of Frye and Turetta does not suggest the features of claim 54. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 18-24, 30, 48-58 and 60-64. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard

Registration No. 39,715

May 24, 2010

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com